

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action mailed October 24, 2007, claims 1-29 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below.

In view of the telephone interview and the Remarks that follow herein, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Roberts, U.S. Patent 6,295,551, in view of Satyavolu, U.S. Patent No. 7,225,464. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites:

A cross-platform single sign-on system for sharing user data across computers on a plurality of computing platforms, the system comprising:
an authentication module for authenticating a user at the beginning of a computing session;
an interface module configured to receive requests for authentication and non-authentication data associated with the user from a plurality of independent local applications on the plurality of computing platforms and, based upon authentication of the user at the beginning of the computing session and responsive to the requests, to automatically provide authentication and non-authentication data to the plurality of independent local applications throughout the computing session; and
a data registry in communication with the interface module for storing and providing authentication data and non-authentication data responsive to requests made by the plurality of independent local applications.

Thus, the claimed invention recites an interface module in communication with a data registry that automatically provides authentication and non-authentication data to a plurality of independent local applications.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest such independent local applications. The first cited reference, Roberts, discusses a call center system enabling a call center representative and a calling party to jointly browse World Wide Web content while simultaneously conducting a voice conversation. (Roberts Abstract). After a user provides a password, the server provides an applet enabling the joint activities (Roberts 11:5-44). Specifically, the server provides a user applet to the calling party's computer and a service applet to the call center representative's computer (Roberts Abstract). The applets then can proceed to share data (16:9-39), such as a demonstration or form.

Such server-provided applets constitute neither "independent" nor "local" applications, as claimed. First, they are not "local applications." Even if applets were considered "applications," they are downloaded and run in response to the decision of a server and are thus plainly not "local." Second, they are not "independent" applications since they have no purpose of their own, independent of another applet. Rather, they exist solely for the purpose of communicating with the other downloaded applet.

Nor does Satyavolu remedy the deficiencies of Roberts. Satyavolu discloses a network-based software application enabling a user to log-in to multiple password-protected web sites using only one manual authentication. (Satyavolu Abstract, 1:66-2:3; 3:56-60). However, remote web pages are plainly not "local applications," as claimed.

Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Roberts and Satyavolu, taken either singly or in combination.

Independent claim 14 as amended recites:

A data registry for storing and providing data across a computing system, the data registry comprising:
a plurality of user data entries, each of the user data entries describing a unique user of a computing system comprised of a plurality of computing platforms and a plurality of independent local applications;
a plurality of authentication entries associated with each of the user data entries for authenticating the user on the plurality of independent local applications of the computing system; and
a plurality of non-authentication attributes and attribute entries associated with each of the user data entries in which information about a user's use of a local application can be preserved.

Thus, claim 14 recites “independent local applications,” and is thus patentable over Roberts and Satyavolu for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Independent claim 18 as amended recites:

A method of sharing data across a computing system, the method comprising:
subsequent to an initial authentication of a user, receiving requests to authenticate the authenticated user from a plurality of independent local applications on a plurality of computing platforms being accessed by the authenticated user;
automatically authenticating the authenticated user to the plurality of independent local applications being accessed by the authenticated user responsive to the initial authentication of the user;
receiving non-authentication data provided by a first instance of the authenticated user using a local application in a first domain;
storing in a data registry the non-authentication data provided by the first instance of the authenticated user using the local application in the first domain;
receiving a request for non-authentication data from a second instance of the local application in a second domain; and
supplying, from the data registry, the requested non-authentication data provided by the first instance of the local application in the first domain to the second instance of the local application in the second domain.

Thus, claim 18 recites “independent local applications,” and is thus patentable over Roberts and Satyavolu for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent

claim 1. It additionally recites a first and a second instance of the local application, the first providing the non-authentication data and the second receiving the non-authentication data. In contrast, neither Roberts nor Satyavolu discloses nor suggests such a first and second instance of an application. The applets of Roberts are plainly distinct, rather than constituting first and second instances of the same application, because the applet types differ based on the role of the person involved. (See, e.g., the aforementioned Roberts Abstract, noting that the server provides a *user applet* to the calling party's computer and a *service applet* to the call center representative's computer; see also column 11, lines 5 and column 10, line 57, noted by the Examiner on page 11 of the Office Action). Even less can the separate web pages of Satyavolu be considered to represent first and second instances of an application, since web pages and web-based applications are inherently centralized and cannot reasonably be said to have separate "instances" for which consistent data is required.

Thus, claim 18 is patentable over Roberts and Satyavolu, taken either singly or in combination.

As to the dependent claims, claims 1-13, 15-17, and 19-27 respectively depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 14, or 18, and recite additional patentably distinct features and limitations. Thus, claims 1-13, 15-17, and 19-27 are patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 14, and 18, as well as for additional reasons pertaining to their added limitations. For example, regarding claim 12, the cited Roberts 9:25-38 merely discloses that an applet itself (cited by the Examiner as constituting the claimed "application") can be persistently stored, thus obviating the need to re-download it during later sessions. However, the applet itself plainly cannot be the non-authentication

data that it uses, and there is no disclosure that any *non-authentication data* is persistently stored.

As another example, claim 16 recites that the non-authentication data of claim 14 includes configuration information. The Examiner cites Roberts 12:66-13:60, which discloses the use of scripts, code providing a mechanism for controlling what information is displayed within a browser. (Roberts 12:66-67). However, dependent claim 16 must be read in the context of its parent claim 14, which recites that non-authentication attributes and attribute entries are comprised by the data registry, are associated with user data entries describing a unique user of the computing system, and preserve information about a user's use of the application. In contrast, Roberts does not disclose that the scripts are comprised by a data registry, are associated with a data registry, or *preserve* information about use of an application (as opposed to merely controlling it at runtime).

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-29, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if he believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
MICHAEL A. HORWITZ, ET AL.

Date: January 24, 2008

By: /Christopher King/
Christopher P. King, Reg. No. 60,985
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7633
Fax: (650) 938-5200